

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 14(b). This replacement sheet, which includes Figs. 14(a) and 14(b), replaces the original drawing sheet including Figs. 14(a) and 14(b).

In Fig. 14(b), reference numeral 81 has been deleted, and reference numeral 80 has been relocated to properly designate a micropore, as supported by paragraphs [0086] and [0087] of the substitute specification filed herewith, for example.

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

Attachment: (1) Replacement Drawing Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12 pending herein have been amended to correct matters of form and for clarification purposes only. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

1. The drawing objection is noted, but deemed moot in view of the changes made to Fig. 14(b) on the Replacement Drawing Sheet attached hereto, which are described on page 10 of this Amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the above drawing objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

2. The objection to the specification is noted, but deemed moot in view of the substitute specification filed herewith, and for the further reasons explained below.

The PTO expressed confusion regarding the meaning of a portion of paragraph [0058] of the original specification. The PTO questioned whether lines 7-13 of original specification paragraph [0058] were intended to convey that, while the coating liquid coats the electrodes at certain predetermined portions, other portions of the electrodes are not coated (see Office Action, page 3, lines 1-4). Applicants respectfully submit that the PTO's understanding is correct, and that the specification has been amended in a consistent manner for clarification purposes and to avoid further confusion. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the above specification objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

3. Applicants respectfully submit that the §112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1-12 is moot in view of the deletion of the word "type" in the rewritten claims submitted above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

4. The §112, second paragraph rejection of claims 4, 5, 10 and 11 is noted, but deemed moot in view of the rewritten claims submitted above. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

5. The §112, first paragraph rejection of claims 4, 5, 10 and 11 is noted, but deemed moot in view of the rewritten claims submitted above, and for at least the further reasons explained below.

Claims 2 and 8 each relate to a continuous coating process, while claims 3 and 9 each relate to an on-demand coating process. Claims 4 and 10 depend from claims 2 and 8, respectively, and recite that the coating application amount can be varied by position during the continuous coating process. Similarly, claims 5 and 11 depend from claims 3 and 9, respectively, and recite that the coating application amount can also be varied by position during the on-demand coating process.

The PTO asserted that these claims were non-enabling, and asserted that paragraph [0056] of the original specification teaches that the coating amount is varied by position *only* when a combination of both continuous and on-demand type coating processes are used. Applicants respectfully submit that these assertions are incorrect.

That is, Applicants respectfully submit that paragraph [0052] of the original specification, which corresponds to paragraph [0073] of the substitute specification submitted herewith, indicates that on-demand coating amounts can be controlled in various positions without being combined with a continuous coating apparatus. Paragraph [0059] of the original specification (paragraph [0080] of the substitute specification) describes the embodiment in Fig. 10, whereby the nozzle positions and sizes are varied to adjust the desired amount of coating liquid delivered and applied to certain discrete portions in an on-demand apparatus.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that paragraph [0055] of the original specification (paragraph [0076] of the substitute specification) teaches that the coating amount and position can also be varied using an XY stage, and again, original specification paragraph [0059] teaches that changing the nozzle size and position in a continuous coating apparatus would also allow for the control and variation of the

amount of coating liquid applied to different portions without having to be combined with an on-demand apparatus.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification provides enabling disclosure to properly support the features of claims 4 and 10 with respect to on-demand coating, and to also support the features of claims 5 and 11 with respect to continuous coating. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

6. Claims 1, 6, 7 and 11 were rejected under §102(e) over Takahashi. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that this rejection is also moot in view of the rewritten claims submitted above.

Specifically, rewritten independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the coating liquid is precisely applied to discrete coating areas in multiple and isolated portions of the electrode. Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed process and resultant structure are not disclosed, suggested or achieved by Takahashi.

Since Takahashi does not disclose each and every feature recited in independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and all claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, define patentable subject matter over Takahashi. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

If the Examiner believes that contact with Applicants' attorney would be advantageous toward the disposition of this case, the Examiner is herein requested to call Applicants' attorney at the phone number noted below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1446.

Respectfully submitted,

October 5, 2006

Date



Stephen P. Burr

Reg. No. 32,970

Nicole J. Buckner

Reg. No. 51,508

SPB/NB/gmh

Attachments: Appendix A - substitute specification
 Appendix B - marked-up specification
 (1) Replacement Drawing Sheet

BURR & BROWN
P.O. Box 7068
Syracuse, NY 13261-7068

Customer No.: 025191
Telephone: (315) 233-8300
Facsimile: (315) 233-8320